

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78280 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-422 Year-2024 Thana- MUZAFFARPUR TOWN District-
Muzaffarpur

=====

Bhola Prasad S/o Late Basudev Prasad R/O Village- Madhuban, Post-
Kalwari, P.S- Kanti, Distt.- Muzaffarpur, At Present MS Vaishno Alankar,
Laxmi Chowk, near Prasad Hospital Brahmpura, P.S- Brahmpura, Distt.-
Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Akhilesh Kumar S/O Ram Aadhar Gupta Branch Manager, Union Bank of
India, Aakharaghat Road Branch Muzaffarpur, P.S- Muzaffarpur (Town),
Distt.- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Dilip Kumar Roy, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia, APP
For the Bank	:	Mr. Nishi Nath Ojha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 21-11-2024 Heard Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, learned Senior

Counsel assisted by Mr. Dilip Kumar Roy, learned counsel for
the petitioner, Mr. Nishi Nath Ojha, learned counsel appearing
on behalf of Union Bank of India and Mr. Pawan Kumar
Chaurasia, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
Muzaffarpur (Town) P.S. Case No. 422 of 2024 registered under
Sections 406, 420, 467, 468/34 and 120B of the Indian Penal
Code.

3. As per prosecution case, allegation against this



petitioner is that he submitted fake and forged valuation report in connivance with loan seeker namely Ram Kumar on the basis of which, loan for Rs. 1,81,000/- was sanctioned.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case due to dirty village politics. Further submission is that the present case has been lodged by the Bank after inordinate delay of seven years and there is no plausible explanation for the same which itself creates doubt over the veracity of the prosecution case.

5. Learned counsel for the State as well as for the Bank vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner by contending that petitioner is named in the FIR and there is direct allegation against him that he submitted fake and forged valuation report in connivance with loan seeker on the basis of which, loan for Rs. 1,81,000/- was sanctioned. It is further contended that petitioner has got 24 criminal antecedents of similar nature. Hence, he does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the rival submissions advanced on behalf of the parties as well as the long criminal history of the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The



prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on his behalf is hereby
rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

utkarsh/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

